Dear Larry, 10/19/83

I've gotten into the Odio chapter and note several marks you made indicating, I assume, that you are impressed with her arguments and reasoning. I've annotated as I go and in each instance she is flawed and wrong and makes basically incorrect assumptions.

I'm where she italicizes for emphases on her M.O. nonsense, 161. She has just set up another of her straw men (160) that Oswald was enticing Bringuier into an illegality by offering him a contribution. She bases her claim that this was illegal on something entirely different and at which she also scoffs in Oswald's writing, that he had turned them in for selling bonds without a license.

Well, making contributions was not at all illegal and was the source of much funding for such groups. Such funds were sought by advertising campaigns, as is usual.

The fact is that Oswald did turn Bringuier in for selling what Bringuier referred to as bonds - at 50 cents each! Some bonds, huh?

Parenthetically, Bringuier, for his own purposes, apparently seeking an explanation, gave the wrong date, 8/5/63. (He also gave 8/2) The secret Service records, published an my initial source, place the date the boys were there much earlier. I interviewed one of them, Geraci, with his mother present and at my inistence, with the family lawyer also present, and I interviewed the mother and father earlier, when Geraci was in 'Nam. The parents gave me the receipts Bringuier gave their son, dated as I recall in may, for the money Geraci turned in, and the mother was able to place the date at just after the end of the school year, when she was going to a dental appointment and drove the boys there.

Davison makes many basically false assumptions and quotes dishonestly to make some appear credible. One is that a patsy is set up only to be convinted. No true. A major purpose is to get some lead time, for the real assassins to get away. Moreover, if the patsy is killed, there then is no trial. She pretnds that Oswald was a fine shot because allegedly Marina said so. In fact, Marina actually said that Oswald was so lousy a shot he never got any game when he went hunting in Russia and his companions shared their kill with him.

She also equates Oswald's purposeful boasting to Bringuier about his "military expertise" with shootingexpertise and the two are anything but the same. Moreover, really good shooting requires regular practise, particularly with the weapon to be used (especially with regard to how it sights) and there is no evidence that Oswald ever got such practise and no reason to believe he ever did, anywhere or at any time. Believe me, the FBI did try to find out.

On 158 you marked where she says that by the end of September JFK's trip to Dallas had not been scheduled or announced, without citing any source. Assume this is true (and with regard to his trip to Texas it is not), who says that the patsy had to be in the TSBD? Or even in Dallas? Planting what pointed to LHO anywhere had the same initial purpose, of giving the assassins time to get away by misdirecting the initial investigation. Thus the next part of what you marked isn't relevant, that later the presence of the patsy elsewhere could be established.

The more she theorizes, while condemning all others as theorists, the more ridiculous this gets, if one knows the facts. 161: her answer to what Oswald was up to with Bringuier. Oswald was going to fix himself up good with Castro's officials, by bringing them "something special: valuable intelligence about the inner workings of an exile training camp" he was allegedly trying to infiltrate only to be frustrated by Bringuier. What a mouthful! First of all, this was either three or five days after it was closed down, depending on which of Bringuier's dates you chose, so there was

nothing left to "inflitrate." What kind of editrs did she have? But even more ludicrous is what this "camp" really was. It was a small frame house close to many other houses just off Pontchartrain Drive, as I remember it (I was there, have pix, interviewed, etc.), in which those loco Cubans had openly stored explosives they had brought in on a U-Haul and then, in cleaning the grounds up, started a trash fire that got out of control. This made all the neighbors, who'd seen the explosives brought in, worry, so they complained to the police and thus the FBI was in on it. Some inner workings, huh?

There were other camps, if she had not identified this, as she did, and they were all jokes, for sucker-bait in raising money. Not a real one anywhere near N.O.

10/20. I've finished it and find it gets increasingly theoretical and conjectural and in all instances flawed and unfactual. I've more annotations than anyone will ever want but I'll put this aside for the archive, where in the future someone perhaps will be interested in a detailed analysis.

She does have a single sentence on the assassination and it fails to account for all of the shots. She misses the missed shot and Tague's wounding.

She has a cutenassumption as part of a solution, that possible coconspirators infiltrated Oswald's non-esisting FPCC, for which she elsewhere admits he refused to accept an applicant (not identified but Bringuier's friend). How does one infiltrate either a one-man or non-esisting FPCC? Or how could Oswald infiltrate Bringuier?

Oswald clearly was hassling Bringuier, if it is of any interest to you. I think it is obvious that Oswald closed down Bringuier's sale of little slips of paper he called bonds because otherwise he had no way of knowing it had happened. I've forgotten my source, but I think the reasoning makes it clear.

Liebeler appears to have been her pet on the Commission, if nothing else. Well, he is the one who deposed Geraci and altered his testimony to make it consistent with Bringuier's yarn, as I recall by altering a question to alter the meaning of the answer. I've checked much of the strange testimony by going back to the typescripts, and this is one instance.

Best wishes,